Agenda Review and a Work Session of the Maricopa County Community College District Governing Board were scheduled to be held beginning at 6:00 p.m. at the District Support Services Center, 2411 West 14th Street, Tempe, Arizona, pursuant to A.R.S. Section 38-431.02, notice having been duly given.

GOVERNING BOARD

Tracy Livingston, President
Johanna Haver, Secretary
Doyle Burke, Member
Alfredo Gutierrez, Member
John Heep, Member
Jean McGrath, Member
Dana Saar, Member

ADMINISTRATION (AGENDA REVIEW)

Rufus Glasper
Maria Harper-Marinick
Debra Thompson
LaCoya Shelton-Johnson
Ed Kelty

ADMINISTRATION (WORK SESSION)

Rufus Glasper
Maria Harper-Marinick
LaCoya Shelton-Johnson
Debra Thompson
Linda Lujan
Shari Olson
Jan Gehler
Steven Gonzales

AGENDA REVIEW

Agenda Review began at 6:20 p.m. Board President Tracy Livingston then took the assembly through the proposed agenda for the May 26, 2015 Regular Board Meeting. Clarification was asked on a few items as they were presented; below are requests made by Board Members for additional information.

CONSENT AGENDA

- **ITEM 13.2 APPROVAL OF PHOENIX COLLEGE PREPARATORY ACADEMY CAP INCREASE FROM 100 TO 400**
    - Was the cap set at 400 to match the cap at GWECHS? (Yes.)
    - What number of students does PCPA actually have room for? (The facility can go to 400 in terms of the campus itself; but other programs would have to move out of the existing space.)
    - What is the process and timeline for making the change? (PCPA can re-apply in January. This would be followed by a site review. PCPA has 130 currently enrolled for next year (and a waiting list) but will only receive payment for 100. PCPA might get funding for the extra 30 students after the cap is increased.)
    - If PCPA has 130 students, how is the budget being balanced to accommodate the extra 30? (PCPA has not increased its staffing; class sizes can accommodate additional students.)

- **ITEM 13.3 APPROVAL OF U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AWARD FOR ARIZONA SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTER NETWORK**
    - Does MCCCD charge rent? (No; this is considered a program of the MCCCD regardless of funding source, like charter schools/auto programs.)
    - Is it a wash? (Administration will review and inform the Board.)
    - Is there an advantage to hosting SBDC on a community college campus vs. another type of organization? (Yes, due to the service area focus; MCCCD wants to make sure it has a good relationship in its partnerships. SBDC is integrated into

entrepreneurial activities at the colleges and collaborates on how to integrate with the business community. From a workforce point of view, community colleges are uniquely set-up to be responsive to employer needs. This flexibility allows community colleges to do things the universities can't.)

o How does this fit into the educational mission of community colleges? If there is a benefit to students, the challenge becomes describing that in a more compelling way. If there is no benefit, or fit into the mission, MCCCD ought to charge rent.

o Do other states have a similar set-up? (This is not unique to Arizona; eight other community colleges do the same. Administration will get the information to the Board.)

  ▪ A Board member remarked that this was integral to MCCCD's mission. The U.S. government has funds set aside to support programs like this and it becomes a way for community colleges to give back to business and industry in the county to help build businesses and infrastructure.

  ▪ Another Board member remarked that this was integral to MCCCD's mission and asked for the Arizona SBDC group to find a time to make a compelling case that it belongs in the MCCCD to the Board. (Administration will work with the Board President to set-up.)

NON-CONSENT AGENDA

- **ITEM 15.2 APPROVAL OF CONCEPTUAL APPROVAL FOR THE SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL BUILDING REMODEL AND EXPANSION AT SCOTTSDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE**
  o When was the last time the building was updated? (No updates since its original construction in 1987.)

ADJOURNMENT

Agenda Review was adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The Work Session was called to order a 6:55 p.m.

POLICY DISCUSSION

President Livingston remarked that the day's focus on Developmental Education (Board Outcome 1.3) stemmed from conversations at the Governance Institute for Student Success (GISS) that was recently held at GateWay Community College. Those conversations allowed Board members to really understand what MCCCD does every day. President Livingston then introduced Dr. Maria Harper-Marinick, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, to continue the conversation.

Dr. Harper-Marinick said that developmental education (dev ed) has become an area of focus for the Board. She has been looking at the data MCCCD collects on who is placing into dev ed a little differently and segmenting those data into multiple categories. She noted that it had not been easy to disaggregate the data which was why she could not share them ahead of time. The preliminary data were based on scores. She asked for the number of students placing into math and English dev ed courses. Dr. Harper-Marinick will provide more detail on the tests used for mathematics for the Board and a breakdown of the scores and classes recommended based on those scores. The English test focuses on writing rather than comprehension. Emphasis is on grammar, punctuation, and the student's ability to build strong sentences and paragraphs to create an essay.

The complexity of the data make it clear that MCCCD will need more than one policy to deal with dev ed students. Specifically, MCCCD may need to come up with options for those who test into different segments of the tests. Also, criteria for students who have been out of high school for more than one year vs. recent graduates may need to be different. One model for all students is not going to work. The tests also do not take into consideration students with an IEP, learning disability, etc.

In order for MCCCD to state x-percent reflects a successful rate for each of these categories, success needs to be defined for each group. A realistic metric should be the goal; the Board can't just pick a number. A Board member noted that not only will there be variation based on criteria already mentioned, but there will likely be some variation by college due to different demographics, income, and approach. Another Board member remarked that such lofty goals cannot be accomplished with adjunct faculty due to time constraints.

Dr. Harper-Marinick said they plan to identify practices based on research that MCCCD wants to see system-wide. They already know MCCCD could do a better job with test preparation by providing students information on what the tests are used for, what they look like, and share sample questions. She noted that new high school assessments should be able to be correlated with the measures put in place at the colleges. A Board member asked about criticisms on the use of ACCUPLACER tests and Dr. Harper-Marinick replied she preferred to plan to use multiple measures including looking at high school GPA and using other diagnostic tools, in addition to placement tests. So MCCCD will look at multiple measures of accelerating students through dev ed, multiple measures in assessing levels of skill, better use of technology, contextualizing (i.e., having subject matter experts working with writing and reading instructors to make class assignments relevant to the course of study), mandatory activities (e.g., mandatory orientation and college success course enrollment), and realizing that not all faculty members come in with the ability and knowledge to teach students with a wide variety of needs so MCCCD will provide standardized models of professional development for all dev ed faculty.

Board Member Recommendations/Observations

- Make dev ed a priority and dedicate resources to really make a dent in this issue and become a national model.
- Review Tempe High School model (ESL Department).
- Get better at targeting interventions to students at the right level; what can be done to partner with high schools to decrease the number of underprepared students.
- Continue to learn what all the colleges are doing.
- Is there a way to justify the additional expense go directly to students so taxpayers do not have to pay for their education twice?
    - Demonstrate the return on investment in getting students through the system in this new manner to show it is more beneficial to work with the students and move them through the system.
    - The largest percentage of students needing dev ed are those who have been out of school the longest and they are the population for which community colleges were originally intended to serve. Taxpayers agreed to serve this group.

Next Steps

- Provide placement process overview to Board.
- Clarify the number of tests being used (mathematics) and how.
- Provide presentations at upcoming meetings on what is working.
- Provide success rates by segment and by college.
- Provide copies of tests.

ADJOURNMENT   The Work Session was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.

_____

Johanna Haver
Governing Board Secretary